DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 969 EA 014 960

AUTHOR Achilles, Charles M.; And Others
TITLE A Study of Issues Related to Discipline, Grouping and Tracking, and Special Education in New Castle County, Delaware, Desegregation Area. Volume III, Addendum: Some Single-Variable Analyses and Some Issues.
INSTITUTION Educational Images, Inc., Knoxville, TN.
SPONS AGENCY Delaware State Dept. of Public Instruction, Dover.
PUB DATE Jul 82
NOTE 15p.; For related documents, see EA 014 958-959.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Students; Class Rank; *Discipline Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Minority Group Children; *Racial Composition; *Racial Discrimination; School Size; Sex; Socioeconomic Status; Student Characteristics; *Suspension; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *New Castle County School District DE

ABSTRACT

This brief third volume of a three-volume study addresses in more detail several analytical issues raised in the first two volumes. The overall study involved research on the former New Castle County (Delaware) School District--reorganized into four districts in 1981--to discover whether the 1979-82 overrepresentation of minority students (mostly blacks) in suspensions, special education, and lower academic groupings resulted from discriminatory practices. Using data from the first two volumes, this part of the study compares the effects on suspensions of variables besides race, including student socioeconomic status, sex, and class rank as well as school enrollment size and percentage of minority students. Analysis using ratios and percentages indicates that not only minority students, but also males, high school students receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and senior high school students in lower class ranks, are all overrepresented in suspensions. Further analysis using Pearson's correlation coefficient reveals no statistically significant relationships between minority suspensions and either school size or percentage of minority students. The author recommends that the schools and the community work on the entire area of discipline rather than on discipline in relation to any one factor. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220969

A STUDY OF ISSUES RELATED TO DISCIPLINE, GROUPING AND TRACKING, AND SPECIAL EDUCATION IN NEW CASTLE COUNTY, DELAWARE, DESEGREGATION AREA

BY:

Educational Images, Inc.
P.O. Box 8610, University Station
Knoxville, TN 37996-4800

STAFF:

Charles M. Achilles
Esther Campbell
Charles Faires
Cynthia Jackson
Oneida Martin

Conducted For:

State Board of Education and State Department of Public Instruction, Townsend Building, Dover, Delaware 19901

Delaware State Board of Education:
Albert H. Jones, President
Robert W. Allen
Harry F. Camper
Richard M. Farmer
Elise Grossman
Kenneth V. Hilton
Raymond E. Tomasetti
William Keene, Executive Secretary and Superintendent of Public Instruction, Delaware

VOLUME III

ADDENDUM: SOME SINGLE-VARIABLE ANALYSES and SOME ISSUES

July, 1982

EA 014 960

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. M. Achilles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANALYSIS OF FOUR FACTORS (RACE/SEX/SES/ACHIEVEMENT) AS "INDEPENDENT" VARIABLES IN SUSPENSION*

NEW CASTLE COUNTY DESEGREGATION AREA
DISCIPLINE STUDY ADDENDUM (6/82)

Volume III

The major portion of the "Discipline Study" final report was submitted to the Delaware State Board of Education and the Delaware State Department of Public Instruction in March, 1982. In April, 1982, staff of Educational Images met with personnel in each of the four school systems (Brandywine, Red Clay, Colonial, and Christina) and with other groups to present and discuss study results. During those meetings and between March and April there were some questions raised by citizens about the study results.

Some questions related to the choice of statistical procedures (not sophisticated enough) and other questions related to the findings. Of major concern was the finding that there was not evident any "institutional" racism and that, in general, the schools were going about the job of educating youngsters generally without regard to race. This finding may have surprised some persons due to the disparity in school suspensions based on the race variable (primarily the two races of Black and White). Note summary table on next page for 1980-81 data (6/81).

---

*Author's Note. The various variables reported here are certainly not independent. However, if one group chooses one variable (e.g., race) and tries to demonstrate "overrepresentation" or "discrimination" and attribute the cause to a single source (e.g., school), then it does not seem unreasonable to array other variables (Sex, SES, achievement) and try to demonstrate a similar "overrepresentation" or "discrimination," and attribute the cause to a single source (e.g., school). Based on the usage of the single variable, if equally plausible alternative "causes" of the overrepresentation can be found, then it seems that there must be further, more sophisticated studies to try to determine the interrelationships among the variables.

TABLE I
PRIMARY SUSPENSION DATA RELATED
TO RACE and SEX (1980-81)

	M		F		B		W		O		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
SUSPENSIONS (A)	6128	70	2609	30	4119	47	4458	51	160	2	8737
ENROLLMENT (B)	24794	51.5	25873	48.5	13851	26	37999	71	1717	3	53367
RATIOS (A/B)	.223		.101		.297		.117		.093		.164

Black (B) pupils, 26 percent of the school population, accounted for 47 percent of the suspension. White (W) pupils, 71 percent of the school population, accounted for 51 percent of the suspensions. Other (O) minorities, three percent of total population, accounted for two percent of the suspensions. The ratios of suspensions to enrollment respectively for B, W, O and Total are (rounded) .30, .12, .09 and .16. Assuming chance or random behavior, one could expect a percent of suspensions that would be close to the percent of representation by race. Thus, if one looks only at race as the single variable of importance in suspensions, Blacks are overrepresented and both Whites and Other minorities are underrepresented. But, are there other variables that provide reasonable or equally plausible bases for overrepresentation? Our initial analyses and other studies suggested that there are. Major variables considered are: Race, Sex, Socio-Economic Status (SES) as shown by Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and class rank. Principal points for comparisons will be the ratios of total suspensions to persons in particular categories. Ratios are computed to 3 decimal places and rounded to 2 places for comparison (see Table I).

The comparison by sex (M, F) shows a marked overrepresentation of males suspended and/or a marked underrepresentation of females suspended. The ratios of suspensions to enrollment respectively for M, F, and Total are (rounded)

.22, .10, and .16. Thus, we find that males account for 51.5 percent of the population and 70 percent of the suspensions and females, representing 48.5 percent of the population, account for 30 percent of the suspensions.

The issue of SES is not easy to isolate for several reasons: SES data are not as exact as sex or race, schools do not keep "SES records," etc. Next, since school records don't include SES data in the general data file, pupils cannot be identified and tracked through SES. As a result, the data are not mutually exclusive -- although a number of pupils can be isolated by SES for analysis, they will also be counted a second time in the comparison group. Thus the comparisons will be low SES as identified by AFDC and Total. (Although a grouping, Non-AFDC can be derived, there was no way to verify a perfect "match" between AFDC records and school records. That is AFDC numbers can be subtracted from Total to derive a "Non-AFDC" group, but there is no way to track individual youngsters).

In the SES comparisons, AFDC data were obtained for each high school, aggregated for each of the four districts, and further aggregated into a total for the combined four districts. No data were collected for junior high schools or any special schools (e.g., ILC). The expanded data appear in Appendix A, Table A-I; Summary data appear in Table II below.

TABLE II
PRIMARY SUSPENSION DATA (HIGH SCHOOLS)
RELATED TO SES (FROM AFDC DATA) 4/82

	TOT [1]	AFDC	TOT [2]	AFDC	TOT [3]	AFDC	TOT [4]	AFDC	TOTAL TOT	AFDC
SUSPENSIONS(A)	452	58	588	86	571	60	852	169	2463	373
ENROLLMENT (B)	4257	144	4250	248	2028	118	4548	304	15353	814
RATIOS (A/B)	.106	.403	.130	.346	.282	.508	.187	.556	.160	.458

Looking only at total data (suspensions and enrollment) described by AFDC and Total (including AFDC), the ratios by district and total appear in Table II.

An AFDC (low SES) pupil is approximately three times as likely to be suspended as is an "average" pupil in the four school systems (.46 to .16). There is some minor variation by district, but the approximate 1 to 3 ratio holds in all but district 3 where the ratio is about 1 to 2. Table III shows the SES data and suspensions distributed into AFDC, non-AFDC, and Total. As expected, the ratios show that suspensions fall disproportionately on AFDC (low SES) youth.

TABLE III
PRIMARY SUSPENSION DATA RELATED TO
SES (AFDC and NON-AFDC) (4/82).

	AFDC		NON-AFDC		
	N	%	N	%	TOT
SUSPENSIONS (A)	373	15.1	2090	84.9	2463
ENROLLMENT (B)	814	5.3	14539	94.7	15353
RATIOS (A/B)	.458	2.85	.144	.896	.160

Table III shows that AFDC youngsters represent 5.3 percent of the total enrollment but account for 15.1 percent of the suspensions; non-AFDC youngsters represent 94.7 percent of the enrollment but account for 84.9 percent of the suspenions. The ratios of suspension to enrollment for AFDC and Non-AFDC youth, respectively, are (rounded) .46 and .14. AFDC youth are more than three times more likely to be suspended than are non-AFDC youth.

Several schools in the New Castle County Desegregation Area compute class rankings. Three senior high schools were chosen to describe the suspension factor related to class rank (No school was selected from Colonial since there is only one high school - William Penn - and it would have been impossible to maintain anonymity.)

Grades 9 and 12 were selected for comparison in each of the three high schools. The method of comparison was suspensions in the top and in the bottom academic quartiles. In the comparisons, all suspensions, students suspended (regardless of multiple suspensions), and out-of-school suspensions only (all

suspensions minus in-school suspensions) were used. No top-quartile student in any of the three schools was suspended more than once, so there is no additional "students suspended" column in any top quartile analysis. In the out-of-school comparisons, we recorded the total number of out-of-school suspensions for grades 9 and 12, the out-of-school suspensions in the top and bottom quartiles, the sum of top and bottom, and the sum of suspensions in the middle two quartiles. The most striking differences, however, as shown in Table IV are between the top and bottom quartiles in both grades compared (9 and 12) and in all three high schools compared. The suspension ratios (ratio of suspensions to enrollment) are .018 and .920 for top and bottom quartiles (9th grade) and .017 and .234 for top and bottom quartiles (12th grade). Put another way, in 9th grade 225 pupils in the top quartile generated only 4 suspensions and the same number of bottom quartile students generated 207 suspensions! In 12th grade 231 top-quartile pupils generated 4 suspensions and 231 bottom-quartile pupils generated 54 suspensions. A bottom-quartile 9th grade pupil is over 45 times as likely to be suspended than a top-quartile ninth grader (for 12th grade it is only about 12 times)! Internal analyses of Table IV show similar results for all schools and grades reported. (See also Table A-II of Appendix A for more detail).

A comparison of suspension ratios for the four "independent" variables (race, sex, SES, achievement) is presented in Table V. Using these results, the most powerful predictor of suspension is school achievement, followed by SES, race and then sex. (See pages 28-32 of Volume I of Discipline Study for more information on possible relationships between achievement and suspensions).

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF SUSPENSIONS BY CLASS RANK (QUARTILE)
IN THREE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (4/82)

	Grade 9 (Top + Bottom Quar.) Suspensions Top N	%	Bottom N	%	Students Bottom N	%	Quartile(N)	Grade 12 (Top + Bottom Quar.) Suspensions Top N	%	Bottom N	%	Students Bottom N	%	Quartile(N)
Suspensions (A)	0		96		36		96	1		23		19		24
Enrollment (B)	80		80		80		80	100		100		100		100
Ratios (A/B)	N/A		1.20		.450		.120	.010		.230		.190		.240
Suspensions (A)	0		52		20		52	2		25		18		27
Enrollment (B)	60		60		60		60	66		66		66		66
Ratios (A/B)	N/A		.867		.333		867	.030		.379		.273		.409
Suspensions (A)	4		59		33		63	1		6		6		7
Enrollment (B)	85		85		85		85	65		65		65		65
Ratios (A/B)	.047		.694		.388		.741	.015		.092		.092		.108
TOTALS SUSP. (A)	4		207					4		54				
ENROLL. (B)	225		225					231		231				
RATIOS (A/B)	.018		.920					.017		.234				

	Grades 9 & 12 (Top, Bottom, Middle two and total) quartiles Out-of-school only (4/82) 9 Top	Bottom	Bottom & Top	Grade TOT	12 Top	Bottom	Bottom & Top	Grade TOT	Middle 2 Quartiles by Grade 9	12
Suspensions (A)	0	62	62	88	1	18	19	23	26	4
Enrollment (B)	80	80	160	315	100	100	200	398	155	198
Ratios (A/B)	N/A	.775	388	.279	.010	.180	.095	.085	.168	.020
Suspensions (A)	0	52	52	81	2	25	27	51	29	24
Enrollment (B)	60	60	120	236	66	66	120	264	116	148
Ratios (A/B)	N/A	.867	.438	.343	.030	.379	.225	.193	.250	.182
Suspensions (A)	3	57	60	116	1	6	7	15	56	8
Enrollment (B)	85	85	170	336	65	65	130	260	166	130
Ratios (A/B)	.035	.571	.353	.345	.015	.092	.054	.058	.337	.062

	TOP	BOTTOM
TOTAL SUSPENSIONS: Grades 9 + 12	8	261
TOTALS by TOP AND BOTTOM QUARTILES	456	456
	.018	.572

TABLE V
COMPARISON OF SUSPENSION RATIOS OF FOUR VARIABLES (RACE, SEX, SES, ACHIEVEMENT)

	SUSPENSION RATIOS (rounded)								ACHIEVEMENT			
	RACE			SEX		SES			Grade 9		Grade 12	
	B	W	O	M	F	AFDC	Non-AFDC	TOTAL	TOP	BOTTOM	TOP	BOTTOM
RATIOS	.30	.12	.09	.22	.10	.46	.14	.16	.02	.92	.02	.23
"odds"	30/12 = 2.5			22/10=2.2		46/14 = 3.3			92/2 = 46		23/2 = 11.5	

Put another way, a male is 2.2 times more likely to be suspended than a female; a Black is 2.5 times more likely to be suspended than a White; an AFDC pupil is 3 times more likely to be suspended than a non-AFDC pupil; a low-quartile grade 9 pupil is 2 6 times more likely to be suspended than the high-quartile pupil; a low-quartile grade 12 pupil is 11.5 times more likely to be suspended than a high-quartile grade 12 pupil, and (using combined data for grades 9 and 12) a low-quartile pupil is 28 times more likely to be suspended than a top-quartile pupil.

Correlations: School Size/Density of Minority Pupils/Suspensions.

Using data from 12 high schools, some correlation coefficients were computed to attempt to isolate additional evidence of patterns (or lack of patterns) in suspensions. For each high school the following data (1980-81) were utilized for the correlations: 1) total enrollment, 2) total suspensions, 3) percent minority enrollment, 4) percent minority suspensions. Pearson product-moment correlations (r) and significance levels are shown in the following table.

If suspensions were directly related to race, one would expect to find strong positive relationships between total suspensions and minority enrollment (r = .186); total suspensions and percent minority suspensions (r = .076); and percent minority enrollment and percent minority suspensions (r = .121). Strong positive relationships were found, however, between total enrollment (school size) and total suspension (r = .872). The larger the school, the more suspensions there are (this makes sense!)

	TOTAL ENROL	TOTAL SUSP.	MINORITY % ENROL	% SUSP.
TOT ENROLLMENT	1.000	.873	.279	.345
sig.	.000	.0002	.379	.273
TOT SUSPENSIONS		1.000	.186	.076
sig.		.000	.563	.813
% MINORITY ENROLLMENT			1.000	.121
sig.			.000	.707
% MINORITY SUSPENSIONS				1.000
sig				.000

The low correlations and the accompanying low levels of significance ($r = .186$, $p \leq .56$; $r = .076$, $p \leq .81$; $r = .121$, $p \leq .71$) strongly point to a lack of systematic bias (e.g., suspensions) based on race. (This does not rule out race as one of several contributing factors). It seems, however, that it would be more fruitful to seek other explanations for the high suspension rates than only race.

Discussion

Suspension and the factors associated with suspension constitute a most complex factor--it seems that no single variable explains suspension in a satisfactory manner. That is to say, it does not seem any more appropriate to attribute suspension to the single variable, race, than it would to attribute suspension to any one of the other three variables considered in this brief analysis--sex, SES, or class rank. However, several of these variables obviously are closely related and interdependent. (Data in Tables in the Appendices show Class Rank suspensions by sex and Race and SES (AFDC) suspensions by sex and Race variables). Although it is clear that the schools must accept some responsibility for over-representation in suspensions by race, clearly the home environment can aid the schools on the achievement issue.

Data presented here indicate that suspension of pupils from schools does not occur "equally" with regard to sex, race, social class, or the pupil's rank in class (achievement). This issue raises many questions. Is it even realistic to expect that discipline in schools (or anywhere, for that matter) is distributed "equally" with regard to all demographic variables? In an institution (i.e., education) where a stated goal is academic achievement, is it suprising to find that those who least achieve the goal are those who most often are in difficulty with the rules, norms and expectations of the institution?* (Any analogies here suffer from weaknesses common to other analogies. The school situation is unique in several ways. First, school attendance is virtually mandatory. Second, schools as currently operated are designed to perpetuate failure. That is, half of the pupils must be below grade level or below the norm. If the system succeeds in getting its pupils to achieve better, the "norm" moves up, assuring that half still "fail.")

Nevertheless, data synthesized in this section support the conclusions and recommendations of Volumes I and II. Discipline is a difficult issue. School and community (home, church, social agencies, key individuals) must work together toward achieving mutual goals. The community should outline behaviors that it expects the schools to enforce without prejudice to any individual. Schools should strive to achieve the goals of education through the support of the community. The focus of community pressure should be on improving education, on educational excellence, and on cooperative approaches to solving educational problems. It seems counterproductive to polarize each issue. (Suspension is based on race. Suspension is based on sex. Suspension is based on S.E.S. It

---

*Who are more likely to violate rules of an athletic team or to drop off the squad? Who are more likely to participate actively in church activities--the religious or non-religious? Who are more likely to keep a job--the industrious or non-dustrious? Measured against the goals and expectations of an institution, those who subscribe to and achieve the goals are most rewarded by the institution; those who do not are less likely to be rewarded.

is only right that suspension be based upon violation of reasonable, mutually agreed upon school rules that are enforced the same for each individual).

Thus, since disparities can be demonstrated in the distribution of suspensions based on several variables, it seems appropriate for school and community to work carefully on the total area of discipline (suspensions in the geographic area under study are high--and more than twice the national average suspension rate) rather on the issue of discipline by race (or by sex, or SES), which only serves to exacerbate polarization. Key issues, then, are 1) school/community communication and cooperation, 2) school program, 3) effective discipline as a component of the total educational activity.

Additional Possible Courses of Action.

Phi Delta Kappa's Commission on Discipline has recently (1982) completed its study on discipline. The Institute for Effective Integrated Education has demonstrated success in reducing suspensions and improving discipline in Cleveland and Columbus, Ohio. There have been other successful activities to reduce discipline problems in selected schools (e.g., St. Louis with Dr. Furtwengler). The National Center for Improvement of Learning (NCIL) of the AASA has demonstrated results in improving pupil achievement through "Mastery Learning" techniques. There are other successful models. The school systems should plan together to seek some solutions to the problem of discipline, and especially, the issue of the excessive suspension in the schools. Schools should strive to reduce the overall suspension rates and ratios as their primary goal. School personnel should constently check themselves (and the processes and policies) to see that discipline is distributed as needed and as equitably as possible. (Note recommendations in Volume I).

TABLE A-I

SUSPENSION DATA RELATED TO CLASS RANK (Quantiles)
AND OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES (Race/Sex)
FROM THREE HIGH SCHOOLS (Grades 9 & 12)

SCHOOL A	BOTTOM QUARTILE Total Suspensions				BOTTOM QUARTILE Total Students Suspended				TOP QUARTILE Total Suspensions (all once)			
	9(n=80)		12(n=100)		9(n=80)		12(n=100)		9(n=80)		12(n=100)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
B M	15	15.6	3	13.0	6	16.7	3	15.8				
B F	36	37.5	6	26.0	14	38.9	4	21.1				
W M	27	28.1	11	47.8	8	22.2	9	47.4				
W F	18	18.8	3	13.0	8	22.2	3	15.8			1	100
B	51	53.1	9	39.1	20	55.6	7	36.8				
W	45	46.9	14	60.9	16	44.4	12	63.2			1	100
M	42	43.8	14	60.9	14	38.8	12	63.2				
F	54	56.3	9	39.1	22	61.1	7	36.8			1	100
Total	96		23		36		19		0		1	

School A: Enrollment 1435. Percent M. 49; F. 51; B. 21; W. 77; O. 2.

SCHOOL B												
	9(n=60)		12(n=66)		9(n=60)		12(n=66)		9(n=60)		12(n=66)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
B M	12	23.1	9	36.0	4	20.0	6	33.3				
B F	12	23.1	2	8.0	5	25.0	2	11.1				
W M	9	17.3	8	32.0	4	20.0	5	27.8			1	50
W F	4	7.7	6	24.0	3	15.0	5	27.8			1	50
O M	11	21.2			3	15.0						
O F	4	7.7			1	5.0						
B	24	46.2	11	44.0	9	45.0	8	44.4				
W	13	25.0	14	56.0	7	35.0	10	55.6			2	100
O	15	28.8	0		4	20.0						
M	32	61.5	17	68.0	11	55.0	11	61.1			1	50
F	20	38.5	8	32.0	9	45.0	7	38.9			1	50
Total	52		25		20		18		0		2	

School B: Enrollment 1040. Percent M. 53; F. 47; B. 15; W. 76; O. 9.

SCHOOL C												
	9(n=85)		12(n=65)		9(n=85)		12(n=65)		9(n=85)		12(n=65)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
B M	16	27.1	1	16.7	9	27.8	1	16.7	1	25.0		
B F	8	13.6			6	18.2			1	25.0		
W M	24	40.7	5	83.3	12	36.4	5	83.3	1	25.0	1	100
W F	4	6.8			2	6.1						
O M	6	10.2			3	9.1			1	25.0		
O F	1	1.7			1	3.0						
B	24	40.7	1	16.7	15	45.5	1	16.7	2	50.0	1	100
W	28	47.5	5	83.3	14	42.4	5	83.3	1	25.0		
O	7	11.9			4	12.1			1	25.0		
M	46	78.0	6	100.0	24	72.7	6	100.0	3	75.0	1	100
F	13	22.0			9	27.3			1	25.0		
Total	59		6		33		6		4		1	

School C: Enrollment 1110. Percent M. 48; F. 52; B. 38; W. 57; O. 6.

TABLE A-II
SUSPENSION DATA BY SES (AFDC) BY HIGH SCHOOLS
CONSIDERING OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES (Race/Sex)

High Schools & District Totals	Enrollment Data									Suspension Data										
	Percent			B		W		O		B		W		O		Percent		Total		1st	
	N	M	F	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	M	F	N	%	N	%
A Tot	925	47	53	147	15.9	767	82.9	11	1.2	41	33	83	67			70	30	124	13.4	94	10.2
A AFDC	22	32	68	12	55	10	45			7	100					29	71	7	31.8	6	27.2
B Tot	1442	50	50	313	21.7	1099	76.2	30	2.1	99	59	63	38	5	3	58	42	167	11.6	112	7.8
B AFDC	44	34	66	38	864	6	13.6			34	100					29	71	34	773	17	38.6
C Tot	767	52	48	195	25.4	566	73.8	6	1	30	31	67	69			72	28	97	12.6	65	8.5
C AFDC	43	28	72	28	65	15	35			2	25	6	75			75	25	8	18.6	4	9.3
D Tot	1123	48	52	196	17.5	912	86.7	15	1.3	34	53	30	47			61	39	64	5.7	41	3.7
D AFDC	35	57	43	33	94.3	2	5.7			6	66	3	34			56	44	9	16.1	6	17.1
Total Tot	4257	49	51	831	20	3344	79	62	1	204	45	243	54	5	1	65	35	452	10.6	3.2	7.3
Total AFDC	144	38	62	111	77	33	23			49	84	9	16			40	60	58	40.3	33	22.9
E Tot	1189	48	52	301	25.3	863	71.6	25	2.2	57	56	45	44	1	1	74	25	103	8.6	80	6.7
E AFDC	35	40	60	25	71.4	9	25.7	1	2.8	10	100					40	60	10	28.5	9	25.7
F Tot	1056	53	47	157	14.9	796	75.4	103	9.7	78	38	84	41	45	22	72	28	207	19.6	131	12.4
F AFDC	55	53	47	23	41.8	9	16.4	23	41.8	19	48.7	5	128	15	385	64	36	39	70.9	22	40.0
	N	M	F	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	M	F	N	%	N	%
G Tot	1106	51	49	248	22.4	828	74.9	30	2.7	50	32	100	65	5	3	73	27	155	14	128	11.6
G AFDC	40	33	67	28	70	8	20	4	10	8	61.5	3	23	2	15.4	54	46	13	32.5	12	30
H Tot	1169	48	52	438	37.5	662	5.56	69	5.6	61	50	56	46	6	5	74	26	123	105	107	9.2
H AFDC	118	45	55	74	62.7	23	19.5	21	17.8	15	125	6	25	3	125	75	25	24	20.3	18	15.2
Total Tot	4250	50	50	1144	25	3149	70	247	5	246	42	285	49	57	9	73	27	588	13	446	9.9
Total AFDC	248	44	56	150	60	49	20	49	20	52	61	14	16	20	23	63	37	86	34.6	61	24.6
I Tot	1495	72	28	316	21.1	1137	76.1	42	2.8	167	42	217	54	18	5	72	28	402	26.9	218	14.6
I AFDC	86	38	62	63	73	17	20	6	7	56	81	10	15	3	4	65	35	69	802	32	37.2
J Tot	1502	51	49	391	26	1072	71.4	39	2.5	77	43	94	52	10	5	74	27	181	12.1	140	9.3
J AFDC	95	41	59	67	70	24	25	4	5	14	50	5	18	9	32	75	25	28	29.5	18	18.9
K Tot	1551	51	49	336	21.7	1176	75.8	39	2.5	104	39	162	60	3	1	63	37	269	17.3	188	12.1
K AFDC	123	53	47	101	82	19	15	3	3	49	68	23	32			53	47	72	585	42	34.1
Total Tot	4548	58	42	1043	23	3385	74	102	3	348	40	473	56	31	4	69	31	852	18.7	546	12.0
Total AFDC	304	45	55	231	76	60	20	13	4	119	70	38	23	12	7	62	38	169	55.6	92	30.3
L Tot	2028	50	50	593	292	1414	69.7	21	1.1	291	51	279	49	3	.5	68	32	571	282	344	16.9
L AFDC	118	39	61	88	75	29	25	1	.1	54	90	6	10	0		43	57	60	50.8	37	31.4
GRAND TOTAL																					